4-14-06

APR 1 3 2006

PTO/SB/21 (04-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

April 13, 2006

Date

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	10/633,749	
	Filing Date	August 4, 2003	
	First Named Inventor	Ken Yamamoto	
	Art Unit	3682	
	Examiner Name	William C. Jovce	

6340-000036 Total Number of Pages in This Submission Attorney Docket Number ENCLOSURES (check all that apply) After Allowance Communication to ☐ Drawing(s) Fee Transmittal Form Technology Center (TC) Appeal Communication to Board of Licensing-related Papers Fee Attached Appeals and Interferences Petition Appeal Communication to TC Amendment / Reply (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Petition to Convert to a Proprietary Information After Final Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Status Letter Affidavits/declaration(s) Change of Correspondence Address Terminal Disclaimer Other Enclosure(s) Extension of Time Request (please identify below): Request for Refund Express Abandonment Request CD, Number of CD(s) Information Disclosure Statement Remarks Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Reg. No. Attorney Name Firm Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C. W.R. Duke Taylor 31,306 Individual name Signature April 13, 2006 Date CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below. Typed or printed name Express Mail Label No. EV 853 856 057 US (4/13/2006) W. R.Duke Taylor

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Signature

**PATENT** 

## THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.:

APR 1 3 2006

10/633,749

Filing Date:

August 4, 2003

Applicants:

Ken Yamamoto

Group Art Unit:

3682

Examiner:

William C. Joyce

Title:

Bearing Apparatus for a Driving Wheel of Vehicle

Attorney Docket:

6340-000036

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

## RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Sir:

In response to the Election Restriction dated March 17, 2006, please consider the following.

The Examiner has restricted the application identifying six groups relating to various figures of Applicant's invention. The Examiner states that the disclosed species may be classified together but the diverging subject matter of each disclosed species is considered a serious burden on the Examiner.

However, this is not the criteria for a serious burden. MPEP 803 states "for purpose of initial requirement, a <u>serious burden</u> on the Examiner may be prima fascia shown by appropriate explanation of separate classification, or separate status in the

art, or a different field of search" as defined in MPEP §808.02. Here, the Examiner has failed to show separate classification, separate status in the art for that a different field of search is required. In fact, the Examiner indicates that the species are classified together. Thus, the Examiner has failed to show a prima fascia case that a serious burden exists. By failing to show that a serious burden exists, the Examiner must examine all of the alleged species on the merits.

In the event that the Examiner disagrees with Applicant's position, Applicant elects Group 1 directed to Figures 1-4 which relate to Claims 1, 2, 3 and 9.

Should the Examiner have any additional questions or comments, he should not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 13, 2006

Bv:

W. R. Duke Taylof

Reg. No. 31,306

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. Box 828 Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303 (248) 641-1600

WRDT/cls